

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 27, 32, and 33 are independent claims. Claims 1-34 stand rejected by the examiner. Assignee traverses the instant claim rejections.

Interview Summary

Assignee's representative would like to thank examiner Cam Y. T. Truong for the courtesies extended to assignee's representative John Biernacki during the telephone interview on March 8, 2007. The interview discussed claim 1's proposed amendment that data pages (within the context of claim 1) store a second key and a third key separately from the root node, index nodes and leaf nodes. The section 101 rejection was also discussed. The remarks and the amendments contained herein further summarize the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

The office action maintains that claims 1-34 should be rejected under 35 USC § 101 because the language of the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea. Assignee respectfully disagrees but to expedite prosecution of the application, assignee has amended the independent claims to recite that a data searching system is used with respect to the data records. In view of the foregoing, assignee submits that the instant rejection has been traversed and that the claims should proceed to issuance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 3, 5-34 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Hara (U.S. Patent No. 6,571,250) in view of Hollines, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,386). Claims 2 and 4 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Hara in view of Hollines and further in view of Li (U.S. Patent No. 6,647,381). Assignee traverses the instant rejections.

Claim 1 recites that data pages store a second key and a third key separately from the root node, index nodes and leaf nodes, wherein the second key and the third key that are stored on the data pages are duplicate keys of the first key that is stored in the leaf node. The first, second and third keys are used by a data searching system for searching the set of the data records. The cited references whether viewed alone or in combination do not disclose, teach or suggest such limitations. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references and should be allowed.

Independent claims 27, 32, and 33 have also been amended to recite similar limitations. Because the cited references (whether viewed alone or in combination) do not disclose such limitations of these claims, claims 27, 32, and 33 are allowable and should proceed to issuance.

[Continued on the next page]

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, assignee respectfully submits that the pending claims are allowable. Therefore, the examiner is respectfully requested to pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

John V. Biernacki
Reg. No. 40,511
JONES DAY
North Point
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-3939